



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/556,865	04/21/2000	Darryl E. Rubin	03797.80028	6686

28319 7590 12/19/2003

BANNER & WITCOFF LTD.,
ATTORNEYS FOR MICROSOFT
1001 G STREET, N.W.
ELEVENTH STREET
WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4597

EXAMINER

LUDWIG, MATTHEW J

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2178

DATE MAILED: 12/19/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/556,865

Applicant(s)

RUBIN ET AL.

Examiner

Matthew J. Ludwig

Art Unit

2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 April 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 and 10-36 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 9 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 3,5-8.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: application filed 4/21/00.
2. Claims 1-36 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 11, 20, and 36 are independent claims.

Claim Objections

3. The Examiner respectfully notes that dependent claim 6 recites 'a pinned page overlaid on *the document*'. It is unclear to the examiner what document Applicant is utilizing for the overlaying, because independent claim 1, from which the dependent claim falls under, includes a first and second document.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. **Claims 1-5, 8, 11-16, and 21-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Graham, USPN 6,647,534 filed (6/30/99).**

In reference to independent claim 1, Graham teaches:

A method for viewing a plurality of documents in a nondirected arrangement and in separate windows, but within the same display. See column 2, lines 45-67 and Figure 7B. The reference does not explicitly disclose the displaying of context of a first and second document context simultaneously; however, the reference includes code for displaying a second current document in the first display area of the display and code for displaying a representation of content of the first current document in a third area on the display. The document display method

Art Unit: 2178

as taught by Graham suggests the simultaneous display of multiple documents (as presently claimed) within a single navigational window. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the browsing techniques of Graham and utilized the single navigational window for displaying multiple documents simultaneously, offering the user the added benefit of enhanced viewing of documents arranged in a non-directed manner.

In reference to dependent claim 2, Graham teaches:

The program can also include code for displaying the second current document in the first display area of the display and code for displaying a representation of content of the first current document in a third area on the display. See column 3, lines 35-42.

In reference to dependent claim 3, Graham teaches:

A step of selecting a second current document from among the pre-fetched documents in response to another signal from the user input device. See column 2, lines 59-64. The reference suggests the first and second documents are different when Graham discloses the pre-fetched documents.

In reference to dependent claim 4, Graham teaches:

A second document is selected from among the prefetched documents in response to a second signal from the user input device. See column 7, lines 63-67. The user input as taught by Graham demonstrates a proficient and similar technique as the pinning signal included within the claim's limitation for displaying a second document.

In reference to dependent claim 5, Graham teaches:

The user can select a portion of the document having a hypertext link using pointer to move to the paper described by the contents of the current document of Figure 7B. The example document in display area of Figure 7B, the active area is the “contents” button. The reference suggests a single command within the select portion of the document for input by the user.

In reference to dependent claim 8, Graham teaches:

Allowing for the retrieval of document associated by one or more links to a first current document to form a first plurality of pre-fetched documents. See column 3, lines 20-40. Using an input device to activate any of the above-mentioned links would have altered the view to a second document context. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the link methods of Graham and utilized the ‘past’ document section as shown in Figure 5 for saving the first document context after moving onto a second document and giving the user the added benefit of improved visual display selections.

In reference to claims 11-16, the claims reflect the computer readable medium used for performing the methods as claimed in claims 1-5, respectively, and in further view of the following, is rejected along the same rationale.

In reference to claims 21-36, the limitations reflect the methods used for performing similar functions as claimed in claims 1-8, and in further view of the following, are rejected under similar rationale.

Art Unit: 2178

6. **Claims 6, 7, 10, 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Graham as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Kanerva, U.S. Patent No. 6,122,649 (filed 5/30/1996).**

In reference to dependent claim 6 & 7, Graham teaches:

Viewing multiple documents based upon user input or user commands. See column 2, lines 45-67. The reference does not explicitly disclose a first document context being '*overlayed on the document comprising at least one command*'. Kanerva teaches a means of overlaying the context within a first document onto the spreadsheet. See column 4, lines 40-67. The overlayed document contains various commands and would have provided a proficient means for allowing a user to manipulate user specific data. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Graham and Kanerva before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the document link method taught by Graham to include the overlay options of Kanerva, because it would have provided the user with the added benefit of custom properties within a browser application and enhanced the display techniques, as taught by Kanerva.

In reference to dependent claim 10, Graham teaches:

Viewing multiple documents based upon user input or user commands. See column 2, lines 45-67. The reference does not explicitly disclose a first document context being '*overlayed on the document comprising at least one command*'. Kanerva teaches a means of overlaying the context within a first document onto the spreadsheet. See column 4, lines 40-67. The overlayed document contains various commands and would have provided a proficient means for allowing a user to manipulate user specific data. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Graham and Kanerva before him at the time the invention was made,

Art Unit: 2178

to modify the document link method taught by Graham to include the overlay options of Kanerva, because it would have provided the user with the added benefit of custom properties within a browser application and enhanced the display techniques, as taught by Kanerva.

In reference to claims 17-19, the claims reflect the computer readable medium used for performing the methods as claimed in claims 6, 7, and 9 respectively, and in further view of the following, is rejected along the same rationale.

In reference to independent claim 20, Graham teaches:

A method for viewing a plurality of documents in a nondirected arrangement and in separate windows, but within the same display. See column 2, lines 45-67 and Figure 7B. The reference does not explicitly disclose the displaying of context of a first and second document context simultaneously; however, the reference includes code for displaying a second current document in the first display area of the display and code for displaying a representation of content of the first current document in a third area on the display. The document display method as taught by Graham suggests the simultaneous display of multiple documents (as presently claimed) within a single navigational window. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the browsing techniques of Graham and utilized the single navigational window for displaying multiple documents simultaneously, offering the user the added benefit of enhanced viewing of documents arranged in a non-directed manner.

The reference does not explicitly disclose a first document context being '***overlayed on the document comprising at least one command***'. Kanerva teaches a means of overlaying the context within a first document onto the spreadsheet. See column 4, lines 40-67. The overlayed

Art Unit: 2178

document contains various commands and would have provided a proficient means for allowing a user to manipulate user specific data. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Graham and Kanerva before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the document link method taught by Graham to include the overlay options of Kanerva, because it would have provided the user with the added benefit of custom properties within a browser application and enhanced the display techniques, as taught by Kanerva.

Allowable Subject Matter

7. Claim 9 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Strahorn et al.	USPN 5,933,140	filed (06/30/97)
-----------------	----------------	------------------

Mortimer et al.	USPN 6,091,930	filed (03/04/97)
-----------------	----------------	------------------

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Matthew J. Ludwig whose telephone number is 703-305-8043. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on 703-308-5186. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-746-7239.

Application/Control Number: 09/556,865

Page 8

Art Unit: 2178

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-4700.

ML

December 10, 2003


STEPHEN S. HONG
PRIMARY EXAMINER